2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	Δ

JOSE BAUTISTA,

Plaintiff,

v.

R. DIAZ,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-03174 NC

ORDER OF SERVICE

Petitioner Jose Bautista, a state prisoner incarcerated at High Desert State Prison, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

I. **BACKGROUND**

Petitioner was convicted by a jury of robbery with a firearm enhancement in the Santa Clara County Superior Court of the State of California. On May 23, 2013, he was sentenced to two years for robbery and a consecutive 20 years for a firearm enhancement in state prison. Petitioner unsuccessfully appealed his conviction to the California Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of California, which on June 10, 2015, denied review of a petition allegedly raising the same claims raised here.

DISCUSSION II.

Legal Standard

This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in Case No. 16-cv-03174 NC

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). It shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the petition are vague or conclusory, palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. See Hendricks v. Vasquez, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990).

Petitioner's Legal Claims В.

Petitioner seeks federal habeas corpus relief by raising the following claim: ineffective assistance of counsel at the sentencing phase. Liberally construed, the claims appear colorable under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and merit an answer from respondent.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown:

- 1. The clerk shall serve by certified mail a copy of this order and the petition and all attachments thereto upon respondent. The clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within 60 days of the date of this order, an answer showing why a writ of habeas corpus should not be issued (or -an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be issued). Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the administrative record that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.
- 3. If the petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within 30 days of his receipt of the answer.

4. Respondent shall file a consent or declination to magistrate judge jurisdiction within 14 days.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 1, 2016

NATHANAEL M. COUSINS United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3 4	JOSE BAUTISTA, Plaintiff,	Case No. 16-cv-03174-NC	
5 6 7 8	v. R. DIAZ, Defendant.	CONSENT OR DECLINATION TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE JURISDICTION	
9	INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate be	low by checking one of the two boxes whether	
10	you (if you are the party) or the party you represent (if you are an attorney in the case)		
11	choose(s) to consent or decline magistrate judge jurisdiction in this matter. Sign this form		
12	below your selection.		
13	() Consent to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction		
14	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), I voluntarily consent to		
15	have a United States magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in this case,		
16	including trial and entry of final judgment. I understand that appeal from the judgment		
17	shall be taken directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.		
18	OR		
19	() Decline Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction		
20	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), I decline to have a United		
21	States magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in this case and I hereby request		
22	that this case be reassigned to a United States district judge.		
23			
24	DATE:	NAME: COUNSEL FOR:	
25		(OR "PRO SE:)	
26			
27		Signature	
28			